

South Dakota State University

Open PRAIRIE: Open Public Research Access Institutional Repository and Information Exchange

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

1969

Protestant Church Members' Attitudes Toward Community in Seven South Dakota Counties

Don Martin

Follow this and additional works at: <https://openprairie.sdstate.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Martin, Don, "Protestant Church Members' Attitudes Toward Community in Seven South Dakota Counties" (1969). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 3571.
<https://openprairie.sdstate.edu/etd/3571>

This Thesis - Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by Open PRAIRIE: Open Public Research Access Institutional Repository and Information Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Open PRAIRIE: Open Public Research Access Institutional Repository and Information Exchange. For more information, please contact michael.biondo@sdstate.edu.

PROTESTANT CHURCH MEMBERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD COMMUNITY
IN SEVEN SOUTH DAKOTA COUNTIES

BY

DON MARTIN

A thesis submitted
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree Master of Science, Major in
Rural Sociology, South Dakota
State University

1969

SOUTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

PROTESTANT CHURCH MEMBERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD COMMUNITY
IN SEVEN SOUTH DAKOTA COUNTIES

This thesis is approved as a creditable and independent investigation by a candidate for the degree, Master of Science, and is acceptable as meeting the thesis requirements for this degree, but without implying that the conclusions reached by the candidate are necessarily the conclusions of the major department.

Thesis Adviser

Date

Head, Rural Sociology Department' Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author gratefully acknowledges the following people who encouraged, inspired, and assisted during the writing of this thesis.

First, to Dr. Robert M. Dimit, project leader and thesis advisor, for his aid and guidance in the development of this thesis;

to Professor Howard M. Sauer, Head of the Rural Sociology Department, who also gave unselfishly of his time and energy;

to Rev. James Patten and the Aberdeen Area Ministry for making this study possible;

to Dr. W. Lee Tucker for his help in the selection and implementation of the proper statistical techniques;

to Dr. Marvin Riley, Dr. Don Field, Professor Douglas Chittick, and Mr. James Satterlee for the use of their libraries and their suggestions;

and, finally, gratitude is expressed to my wife, Laura, for the editing and typing.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY	1
Introduction	2
Statement of the Problem	4
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	6
Introduction	6
General Concepts of Attitudes	6
Earlier Literature on Rural-Urban Attitudes	12
Contemporary Literature on Rural- Urban Attitudes	13
Summary	19
III. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	22
Introduction	22
Reference Group Theory	23
Relationship Between Reference Group Theory and Rural-Urban Attitudes	28
IV. METHODOLOGY	31
Introduction	31
Rural	31
Progress	32
Interview and Sampling Procedures	33
The Interview Schedule	35
Analysis Procedure	36
Research Hypotheses	37

Chapter	Page
V. THE FINDINGS OF THE STUDY	38
Introduction	38
Community Services	38
Community Integration	42
Civic Responsibility	49
VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	54
Summary	54
Conclusions	56
LITERATURE CITED	58
APPENDIX A	61
APPENDIX B	67
APPENDIX C	98

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Adult Education Should be an Essential Part of the Local School Program	40
II. No Community Improvement Program Should be Carried on that is Injurious to Business	43
III. Each One Should Handle His Own Business as He Pleases and Let the Other Businessmen Handle Theirs as They Please	44
IV. A Strong Chamber of Commerce is Beneficial to Any Community	45
V. Leaders of the Chamber of Commerce are Against the Welfare of the Majority of the Citizens of the Community	46
VI. A Community Would Get Along Better if Each One Would Mind His Own Business and Others Take Care of Theirs	47
VII. All Unions are Full of Communists	48
VIII. The Good Citizen Encourages the Widespread Circulation of All News Including That Which May be Unfavorable to Them and Their Organization	49
IX. Government Officials Should Get Public Sentiment Before Acting on Major Municipal Projects	51
X. Modern Methods and Equipment Should be Provided for All Phases of City Government	52

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

This study was developed as a result of an effort by the Aberdeen Area Ministry to assess the attitudes of members of its congregations toward their churches and their communities. It was felt the ministry could better serve if any disparity between their role and the perception of this role by parishoners was alleviated.

As a result of striving to find means to improve services it was decided that a survey would be conducted. The result would be the determination of church members' attitudes toward their churches and their communities. From this eminate two studies, one of which deals extensively with church members' attitudes toward their churches, while the other focuses on church members' attitudes toward their community.

The former was accomplished by Hadley Klug and Dr. Robert M. Dimit in conjunction with the Aberdeen Area Ministry.¹ The second aspect, church members' attitudes toward their community, is the central focus of this study

¹Hadley Klug, "A Study of Selected Factors Associated With Members' Attitudes Toward Their Churches in the Aberdeen Area of South Dakota" (unpublished Master's thesis, Dept. of Rural Sociology, South Dakota State University, 1968).

which also originated through the efforts of the Aberdeen Area Ministry and Dr. Robert M. Dimit.

While the central focus of this study is the attitudes of church members toward their community, some implications for the broader issue of rural-urban attitudes are inherent.

Introduction

Within the last century, the United States has experienced a vast urbanization and industrialization trend resulting in an unparalleled movement of population to urban centers. While the urban centers have received migrants from other urban places, the countryside has provided the bulk of migrants to the cities.²

Concomitant with the population exodus from rural to urban areas, there has been an urbanizing influence on rural values and attitudes. That is, attitudes endemic to rural areas have become less distinct from attitudes traditionally attributed to urban areas.

Many prominent people contend that there continues to exist distinct or separate attitudes among residents of rural and urban areas. The following excerpt seems to be illustrative of this characterization.

²J. H. Kolb and E. de S. Brunner, A Study of Rural Society: Its Organization and Changes (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1935), p. 11.

Rural residents are supposed to be conservative, industrious, superstitious, fatalistic, to possess stability, to lack cooperative qualities, to be of a magnanimous turn of mind, mystical in outlook, to be religious, dogmatic, prejudiced, strait-laced in morals, stern and just, patient, stolid, introspective, versatile, impressionistic, suspicious, to possess much common sense, to be of sound and adequate judgement, to be independent in forming judgements, to possess deep convictions, to be meditative, to have fixed purposes, to have endurance, to be immune to radicalism, to have peace of mind, to practice simplicity, to feel aversion for fads and show, to practice thrift and frugality, to assume responsibility readily, to have initiative, to be resourceful, frank, hospitable, sympathetic, and to lack socialization.³

This characterization is attributable in part to prevalent attitudes toward types of community organization which purportedly originate distinct forms of interaction. Robert Bierstedt proposes the following condition to support his contention of rural-urban community differences:

While rural communities differ considerably from one another, each one exerts in far greater measure than does the city a common influence on its inhabitants. In the city the ways of life are legion, and the diversities of its man-made scene admit extreme variations of equipment and opportunity . . . there are few common tasks, few incidents which all men share. There are few impressive signs to call out at the same moment those universal comments and reflections which make man kin to man.⁴

The implicit inference in statements such as Bierstedt's is that the form of community organization

³Paul Landis, Rural Life in Process (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1948), p. 120.

⁴Robert Bierstedt, The Social Order: An Introduction to Sociology (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1963), pp. 418-419.

plays a major role in the formulation of an attitudinal construct. Thus, the urban dweller is likewise described as having certain traits such as individual variability, a relative absence of intimate personal acquaintance, a segmentalization of human relations coupled with anonymous, superficial, impersonal, and transitory relationships.⁵ Still other related phenomena should be found in the urban milieu if this view of the influence of social organization is tenable. Such things as a high level of mobility, instability of societal institutions and differentiation of statuses would be inherent in an urban setting.⁶

Statement of the Problem

A study of the attitudes of both rural and urban church members provides an opportunity to test the relationship implied in the introduction stated above. Explicitly stated, the problem with which this research deals is to determine the importance of residence as a factor in attitudes held toward selected aspects of community life. This is interwoven with the objectives of the study which are:

⁵Louis Wirth, On Cities and Social Life (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964), p. 225.

⁶Ibid.

1. To determine the existence or non-existence of rural-urban attitudinal differences of church members toward community services.
2. To determine the existence or non-existence of rural-urban attitudinal differences of church members toward community integration.
3. To determine the existence or non-existence of rural-urban attitudinal differences of church members toward civic responsibility.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

There is an immense volume of literature dealing with the study of attitudes. This discussion will concentrate on those studies bearing mainly on the nature of attitudes held by rural and urban people toward selected phenomena. However, it is essential to review literature relevant to the general concept of "attitude" as a basis for approaching the study of rural and urban attitudes.

General Concepts of Attitudes

There appears to be considerable agreement among most social scientists concerning what is meant by attitudes in general. Lundberg¹ summarizes his discussion of attitudes in the following statement:

LaPiere² has helped clarify the nature of attitudinal behavior by the following classification of all human behavior into four phases or levels--(1) overt-symbolic, which includes the acts of speaking, writing, and gesturing; (2) overt-nonsymbolic, which includes such directly significant acts as driving a car and closing a door; (3) covert-symbolic, or what is

¹G. A. Lundberg, Social Research (New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1946), p. 213.

²R. R. LaPiere, "The Sociological Significance of Measurable Attitudes," American Sociological Review, 1938, pp. 175-182.

commonly designated as thought; (4) covert-non-symbolic, or what is referred to as feeling states, and emotions. Class (1) is clearly the phase with which most attitudes studied hitherto have been concerned, and will be the chief concern in this thesis; (2) refers to a phase of behavior which most students would probably declare non-attitudinal; classes (3) and (4) are perhaps generally regarded as attitudinal.

LaPiere goes on to say:

The term attitude then will be employed in the present discussion merely as a blanket symbol for a hypothetical set of the organism toward the object or situation to which adjustment is called for or a reaction tendency preparatory to overt adjustment. But as Bernard points out it can be known and communicated to another only through its overt-symbolic responses. Hence the only scientific approach to the study of attitudes is the selection of some or all of these responses . . . there are two general types of approach to a person's social attitudes: (1) we may study as far as possible all of a person's past and present overt-non-verbal and verbal behavior in given situations, and from this behavior infer his attitude; or (2) we may infer his attitude from a study of his verbal behavior in the form of specific opinions.³

It is the latter approach which will be utilized in this thesis.

Sherif and Sherif⁴ contend that attitudes are formed in relation to situations, persons, or groups with which the individual comes into contact in the course of his development. Once they are formed, they determine that the individual will react in a characteristic way to

³Ibid., p. 213.

⁴Muzafer Sherif and Carolyn Sherif, An Outline of Social Psychology (New York: Harper and Row, 1956), pp. 490-495.

these situations. Thus, forming an attitude toward an object is not a mundane matter, for it means the individual is no longer neutral to the object. An attitude thus plays a significant role in determining the mode of behavior relevant to a specific norm. But all modes of behavior are not attitudes. Sherif and Sherif suggest the following criteria for differentiating attitudes from other modes of behavior:

- (1) Attitudes are not innate. They are formed or learned in relation to given objects, persons, groups, and events. This criterion differentiates an attitude from biogenic motives . . . the initial appearance of an attitude is dependent on learning.
- (2) Attitudes are more or less lasting. This criterion literally means more lasting or less lasting. The implication is that since they are learned, attitudes are not immutable. As long as an attitude lasts, its functioning is not subject (within limits) to the ups and downs of the state of the organism.
- (3) Attitudes always imply a subject-object relationship. In other words, attitudes are not formed in thin air. They are formed or learned in relation to an identifiable referent.
- (4) The referent of an attitude may encompass a small or large number of items. This implies the process of generalization, which is the essential process of concept formation.
- (5) Attitudes have motivational-affective properties. This criterion differentiates an attitude from other learned items. An attitude is thus goal directed.⁵

These criteria differentiate attitudes from other predispositions and apply to social as well as nonsocial

⁵Ibid., pp. 494-495.

attitudes. The feature which separates a social attitude from other attitudes is that the former are shared. Social attitudes are formed in relation to one's group values or norms.

McDavid and Harari⁶ strongly concur. The authors indicate that "attitude" is one of the most useful concepts which has evolved to deal with the organization of experience and behavior. Furthermore, they contend, attitude is a hypothetical construct which refers to something that can not itself be directly observed. They do agree that attitudes can be inferred from their observable effects on judgement, but caution the researcher in using the concept scientifically since there may be danger in over-extending them as though attitudes were actually observable. For this reason they define attitudes as: "A relatively stable system of organization of the behavior displayed by a person toward a particular object or set of objects."⁷

Hubert Bonner approaches the concept of attitudes with a great deal of trepidation. His opening statement is:

There is no problem in the whole area of social psychology which has held a more sustained interest,

⁶John W. McDavid and Herbert Harari, Social Psychology: Individuals, Groups, Societies (New York: Harper and Row, 1968), pp. 128-167.

⁷Ibid., p. 129.

and none which is more chaotic. The subject has been so extensively and controversially treated by sociologists . . . that the student of the subject well-nigh despairs of injecting order into the large mass of published material.⁸

Bonner gives credit to the discipline of sociology for first utilizing the concept "attitude," citing Giddings in his Principles of Sociology⁹ (1896) as the originator of the term. Thomas and Znaniecki in their five-volume work, The Polish Peasant in Europe and America¹⁰ (1918-1920), introduced "attitude" into the literature of social psychology.

The credit for instituting the concept of attitude as a permanent and central feature of sociological writing must be assigned to Thomas and Znaniecki who gave it systematic priority in their monumental study of Polish peasants.¹¹

Since attitudes, thus far, have been defined as more or less enduring states of readiness to respond to situations, it might be inferred that they represent a static element. Attitudes are by no means fixed and unchanging predispositions. Their complexity and their

⁸Hubert Bonner, Social Psychology (New York: American Book Company, 1953), pp. 172-200.

⁹Franklin Henry Giddings, The Principles of Sociology (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1923).

¹⁰William I. Thomas and Florian Znaniecki, The Polish Peasant in America (New York: Dover, Reissued 1958).

¹¹Hubert Bonner, op. cit., p. 173.

role in patterning behavior can better be understood if we think of them in a more dynamic context since it can be misleading to conceive of them in static terms, as factors making for rigidity and similarity of behavior. Attitudes are subject to change.

There are many kinds of attitudes; but for the purpose of this study, certain attitudes are important because they relate to social behavior and issues. It is important to recognize that an attitude represents a predisposition for action and not the action itself. An earlier study by LaPiere illustrates this idea:

While traveling through the United States accompanied by a Chinese couple, LaPiere only once was refused service by some 66 sleeping and 184 eating establishments. When the trip was over, he mailed a questionnaire to each of these concerns asking if they would accomodate Chinese. About half returned the questionnaires. The bulk of the replies (93 percent of the restaurants and 92 percent of the sleeping places) stated that they would not take Chinese as guests.¹²

Here is a clear example of an attitude being present but not expressed in overt behavior. LaPiere's investigation does not mean that the study of attitudes is without meaning, but it serves as a warning not to assume that attitudes always affect behavior. Behavior is determined not only by attitudes, but also by situational determinants.

¹²Richard T. LaPiere, "Attitudes vs. Actions," Social Forces, Vol. 13 (1934), pp. 230-237.

Earlier Literature on Rural-Urban Attitudes

Pitirim A. Sorokin and Carle C. Zimmerman were among the first sociologists to concern themselves with rural attitudes.¹³ As early as 1929 they noted the fact that most rural residents were members of both the laboring class and the proprietorial class. This made rural residents somewhat similar, in class composition, to urban employees and laborers. But, their attitudes, conduct, and sympathies made it impossible for them to be solely identifiable either with the labor class or the proprietorial class of an urban society.

It would be expected that ambivalence would arise from such a situation, but the converse was true. The rural attitudes and psychology were characterized by a greater stability, simplicity, idealism, religiosity, dogmatism, and generally by what Sorokin referred to as "a greater peace of mind."¹⁴ These characteristics, Sorokin attributes to differences in the rural and urban environmental conditions such as: lower mobility of the rural dweller; less intensive and less complex interaction; greater homogeneity; and the nature of the agricultural

¹³Pitirim A. Sorokin and Carle C. Zimmerman, Principles of Rural-Urban Sociology (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1929).

¹⁴Ibid., p. 202.

occupation.¹⁵

Environmental conditions, Sorokin contends,¹⁶ also stand in a close relationship to the preservation of nationalism and patriotism. Thus, it would seem probable that rural residents would have a more positive attitude toward nationalism, in terms of a love of their own country or region, than those in the urban population. To rephrase Sorokin's idea, it could be said that the city is more "cosmopolitan" while the country is more "provincial."

The attitudinal dissimilarities discussed are not due to inherent qualities of either the rural or the urban populace. Instead, they are a result of basic environmental and social conditions of both rural and urban areas. With an improvement in communication and transportation and an increase of interaction, the differences can only be weakened.

Contemporary Literature on Rural-Urban Attitudes

Olaf Larson and Everett Rogers show there are seven alterations in contemporary rural society:

- (1) An increase in farm productivity per man has been accompanied by a decline in the number of farm people in the United States.

¹⁵Ibid.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 407.

(2) Linkage of the farm with the nonfarm sector of American society is increasing.

(3) Farm production is increasingly specialized.

(4) Rural-urban differences in values are decreasing as America moves in the direction of a mass society.

(5) Rural people are increasingly cosmopolitan in their social relationships due to improved mass communications, transportation, and the realignment of locality groups.

(6) There is a trend toward a centralization of decision making in rural public policy and in agribusiness firms.

(7) Changes in rural social organization are in the direction of a decline in the importance of primary relationships (such as in locality and kinship groups) and an increase in the importance of secondary relationships (such as in special interest formal organizations, government agencies, business firms).¹⁷

Numbers four and five are the most germane to a discussion of rural-urban attitudes. Moreover, Larson and Rogers found that the changes in rural values emanate from "historical, occupational, and ecological differentials";¹⁸ at the same time the isolation which has been characteristic of rural life is disintegrating. This aids the trend toward a mass society by which; "(1) mass communications pass the same ideas along to everyone in a society at about the same time, and (2) the population displays more

¹⁷Olaf Larson and Everett Rogers, "Rural Society in Transition: The American Setting," Our Changing Rural Society: Perspectives and Trends, ed. James H. Copp (Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press, 1964), pp. 39-67.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 53.

standardized values."¹⁹

Larson and Rogers, in a like attempt to enumerate rural-urban attitude differences, formulate six dissimilarities but utilize extreme caution in doing so. They cite differences in values toward education, toward abstinence from drinking alcohol, personal freedom and independence from governmental intervention, and the value placed on rural life.²⁰

They agree that there is a paucity of pertinent data to support the idea of rural-urban differences but do indicate some behavioral differences such as fertility and occupation.²¹ Fertility serves very well to illustrate the lack of non-differentiation inherent in Larson and Rogers' somewhat heuristic models.

If fertility is to be used as an indication of rural-urban attitudinal differences, another relevant idea must be introduced at this point. Kenkel²² shows that all of the fertility indices indicate there are a greater number of children born to Negro than to White women. This Negro-White differential, furthermore, cuts across

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Ibid., p. 54.

²¹ Ibid., p. 56.

²² Kenkel, op. cit., p. 216.

differences in class and residence. Even though urban Negroes have lower fertility rates than rural Negroes, both of these groups have greater fertility rates than their counterparts in the White group.

Larson and Rogers conclude with the following statement: "The modern American farm population resembles the urban population more than it does the farm population of 1900."²³

Robin M. Williams, Jr., lends strength to Larson and Rogers' perspective, albeit inadvertently, by inscribing a catalogue of American value orientations. These value orientations are actually an abstracting of certain dominant cultural themes which serve as models against which contradictions can more readily be compared. They are of special import in a discussion of rural-urban attitudes because they suggest a hypothesis of no difference between rural-urban attitudes.

As a first approximation to a comprehension of Williams' value configurations, it may be noted that the problem has been approached with reservation. Williams is cautious of such an overwhelming task and indicates that the value configurations only represent tendencies but do bring out regularities that would otherwise not be

²³Larson and Rogers, op. cit., p. 54.

discernible.

Williams cites the following as dominant American themes:

Achievement and success, activity and work, moral orientation, humanitarian mores, efficiency and practicality, progress, material comfort, equality, freedom, external conformity, science and secular rationality, nationalism-patriotism, democracy, individual personality, and racism or group-superiority themes.²⁴

He further indicates that in every society certain men can be found participating in groups to which they feel they owe loyalty and with which they identify. There are other groups identified as outgroups toward which the individual may feel hostility. This intergroup cleavage involves a stratification of attitudes which is similar to ethnocentrism.

Basically what Williams is asserting is that there is no rural-urban dichotomy of attitudes because of a disparity of systems of social interaction. Instead, both rural and urban systems of interaction stand in juxtaposition since all known societies are largely ethnocentric. Williams goes on to state:

Individuals everywhere tend to give a preferential value to their own culture . . . ethnocentrism applies to every distinctive group from the smallest clique to

²⁴Robin M. Williams, Jr., American Society: A Sociological Interpretation (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1960), pp. 412-470.

the largest civilization. Today, however, the attitudes attached to the nation-state have overwhelming importance.²⁵

The importance of Williams' approach lies in the fact that his list of American themes or attitude syndromes takes as its basic social reality all of American culture. In doing so it is ascribing to rural and urban people alike the characteristics which earlier had been attached to rural people alone. It would seem, therefore, manifest attitudinal differences depend on what basic social reality is being analyzed. These ethnocentric attitudes are also important to another sociologist whose views reflect the mainstream of contemporary sociological views toward rural-urban attitudinal differences.

Louis Wirth²⁶ propounded a typology similar to Sorokin's which is also very useful as an analytic tool for examining attitudes. It is somewhat inadequate but succinctly outlines a number of sociological propositions concerning the relationship between numbers of population, density of settlement, and the heterogeneity of inhabitants. It is through analysis of the interrelationships of these criteria that their effect on attitudes can be assessed.

Population density suggests individual variability,

²⁵Ibid., p. 457.

²⁶Louis Wirth, On Cities and Social Life (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964), pp. 65-73.

an absence of intimate personal contacts, diversification and specialization. It does so primarily because of the interdependence of numbers of population with population density and the heterogeneity of the population.²⁷ But, these social differences are rapidly disappearing, according to Wirth. Urban attitudes now dominate rural areas.

Urban life-styles and attitudes are diffused to rural areas through transportation, education, and the mass media. The social and economic well-being of the rural area depends upon decisions made in Washington, D.C.²⁸ This actually portrays the major contemporary theories of rural-urban attitudes very well. The pervasive thread which weaves these theories together is the idea of a similarity between rural and urban attitudes.

Summary

In the light of the previous discussion it seems that certain salient features are common to all the proposed definitions of attitudes. They are:

- (1) Attitudes have a subject-object relationship. That is, they always involve the relation of the individual to a specific situation in his environment. Attitudes may focus on objects, persons, groups, institutions, and values or

²⁷Ibid., p. 211.

²⁸Leonard Broom and Philip Selznick, Sociology: A Text With Adapted Readings (New York: Harper and Row, 1968), p. 437.

norms but there must be a subject-object relationship.

- (2) Attitudes are formed. They are not innate predispositions to action. On the contrary, they are always formed in a socio-cultural milieu.
- (3) Attitudes have affective properties. They are affectively charged because they are held in important values such as the church or nation. They are also affective because they are bound up with an individual's status in the community.
- (4) Attitudes are enduring states of readiness. Many of our everyday needs, such as hunger, are relatively momentary but attitudes are relatively enduring states of readiness. They tend to persist because they are learned, i.e., because they are formed by the individual in his contact with others.
- (5) Attitudes are as numerous and varied as the objects to which they refer. The validity of this final criterion should be evident for clearly attitudes will vary with the number and variety of the responses which the individual makes.

The nature of attitudes should now be clear. They are, briefly, implicit responses or predispositions, or states of readiness to act in a characteristic manner. They are conditioned and acquired in interaction with others in the process of socialization.

The general conclusion which follows from the above review of literature is that there exists a need to consider exactly what is meant by the term "rural" before it is used to categorically define a given set of attitudes. Sorokin and Zimmerman represent earlier sociological attempts at delineating rural attitudes. Their concepts

along with those of Larson and Rogers, Robin Williams, Jr., Louis Wirth, and Leonard Broom and P. Selznick were reviewed to gain some degree of understanding of rural-urban attitudinal differences.

CHAPTER III

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Introduction

Reference group theory is a general sociological frame of reference with wide applicability. It provides the basic conceptual framework of this study. Reference group theory is applicable to the study of rural-urban attitudes toward community in two ways. First, other people are frequently used as frames of reference for the formation of one's own attitudes toward his community. Second, the frame of reference one uses to define his situation is dependent upon his place of residence. Thus, location of residence plays a role in the formulation of attitudes through the acquisition of a particular reference group. Robert K. Merton clarified this orientation by distinguishing reference groups from membership groups.

Merton characterizes a group in terms of three criteria: (1) a group comprises a number of individuals who interact with one another on the basis of an established pattern; (2) these persons who interact must define themselves as constituting the group; and (3) these persons must be defined by others as constituting members of the

group.¹ With this definition in mind we are able to differentiate groups from other categories of people such as crowds or collectives. While the individuals in a social category have similar characteristics, such as sex or age, they are not oriented toward sustained interaction with one another, hence, they do not espouse a common body of norms.²

Reference Group Theory

A factor which plays an important role in the formulation of an individual's attitudes is his reference group. Sherif and Sherif formulate a definition of reference groups by indicating how they may differ from membership groups.

Reference groups are those groups to which the individual relates himself as a part or to which he aspires to relate himself psychologically. In everyday language, reference groups are those groups with which he identifies or aspires to identify himself.³

Thus, a reference group is not necessarily one to which an individual belongs, although it may be.

If an individual has motives similar to those of others and interacts with others in a group situation to

¹Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1957), p. 284.

²Ibid., p. 286.

³Muzafer Sherif and Carolyn Sherif, An Outline of Social Psychology (New York: Harper and Row, 1956), p. 175.

such an extent that he internalizes the values and norms of the group it is obvious that he will assume some of the identity of the group, i.e., he will acquire some of the group characteristics which he had a hand in making. His sense of identity as well as his pride will be intimately related with the group.⁴

Ordinarily, then, the attitudes of an individual are derived from the values and norms of a group in which he is an actual member. These groups to which a person actually belongs--as a father, son, member of a fraternal group, student, or gang--may be designated as membership groups. George Herbert Mead laid the foundation for reference group theory in a discussion of significant and generalized others. As Mead put it:

The individual experiences himself as such, not directly, but only indirectly, from the particular standpoints of other individual members of the same group to which he belongs.⁵

Mead never indicated precisely who these "others" were, but clearly in the case of a very young child the others who are significant are members of the immediate family. The generalized other represents the social group to which the individual relates himself or to which he

⁴Ibid., p. 179.

⁵George H. Mead, Mind, Self, and Society (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934), p. 138.

belongs.

The term "reference group" was coined by Hyman⁶ in an investigation of socio-economic status. Hyman found that the socio-economic status to which a person thinks he belongs could not be predicted directly from such factors as occupation, education or income. To a large extent it was dependent upon what groups were utilized as the framework from which to make judgements. People showed a great variation in the groups they selected as frameworks for judgements. Thus, Hyman found it necessary to distinguish between a membership group and a reference group since the latter is actually employed by the individual as a basis for self-comparison.

Newcomb,⁷ in his studies of a women's college, noticed that many of the students, who came from politically conservative families, assumed more liberal attitudes over the course of their academic careers. Furthermore, the development of attitudes was related to the girls' social interaction within the college milieu. Thus, Newcomb contended, the structure of attitudes of the subject under surveillance depended on whether she used the

⁶H. H. Hyman, "Archives of Psychology," The Psychology of Status, No. 269 (1942).

⁷Theodore M. Newcomb et al., Readings in Social Psychology (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1952), p. 415.

college community or her family community as a frame of reference.⁸ The significance of these studies, referred to as the Bennington studies, lies in their support of the thesis that, in a community characterized by specifically approved attitudes, the individual's attitude development is primarily a function of the way he relates himself to the membership group as well as the reference group.

Perhaps a work which stimulated more thinking relative to reference groups than any other was Samuel Stouffer's The American Soldier.⁹ One of the most significant generalizations propounded by that work concerned peoples' attitudes toward the deprivation they were undergoing as a result of military service. It was found that a person's attitude toward deprivation was attributable less to the actual deprivation than to whatever criterion was utilized in the evaluation of that condition. It was found that Southern Negroes evaluated their army experience more favorably than did Northern Negroes. Further, the smaller the opportunity for promotion in a unit, the more favorable were the opinions relative to the promotions.¹⁰ These findings were explained by the concept of "relative

⁸Ibid., pp. 417-425.

⁹S. A. Stouffer et al., The American Soldier (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1949).

¹⁰Ibid., p. 155.

deprivation." Thus, the Southern Negro felt less deprived by army life because he evaluated his condition relative to that of the Southern Negro civilian, while the Northern Negro soldier used the Northern Negro civilians as his reference group. The negative correlation between the opportunity for promotion and favorable opinions toward it was explained by showing that, when the rate of promotion is high, the person who remains in the same rank will compare himself to those who have been promoted and as a result will feel frustrated and deprived. Although relative deprivation is a special case of reference group behavior, it does illustrate the process whereby a person relates himself to specific groups as well as to other individuals and utilizes them as frames of reference for his own attitudes.

Another important contribution to reference group theory was made by H. H. Kelley.¹¹ Kelley, in an analysis of the functions of reference groups, discerned two functional types of reference groups, which he labeled the normative and the comparative. The normative type sets and maintains standards for the individual, while the comparative serves as a mode of comparison by virtue of which the individual evaluates himself and others, i.e., it allows

¹¹Newcomb, op. cit., pp. 410-414.

him to evaluate his status relative to other statuses.

J. Milton Yinger in a discussion of contra-culture¹² brings out two additional facets to reference groups by showing that there are both positive and negative reference groups. While the former is a reference group whose norms are adopted as a frame of reference, a negative reference group is one whose norms are rejected in favor of counternorms.

Relationship Between Reference Group Theory
and Rural Urban Attitudes

"Hempel has likened a scientific theory to a network, in which the terms or concepts are represented by the knots, and the definitions and hypotheses by the threads connecting the knots."¹³ The integration of reference group theory, as a theoretical framework, with the observational plane involves the major hypothesis of this study.

The hypothesis of no difference between rural-urban attitudes toward community progress is related to reference group theory in that there is no longer a significant gap in communications or transportation between rural and urban areas. The mass media of contemporary America finds its

¹²Milton J. Yinger, "Contraculture and Culture" American Sociological Review, Vol. XXV (October, 1960).

¹³Claire Selltitz et al., Research Methods in Social Relations (New York: Holt, Rhinhart and Winston, 1951), p. 285.

way into homes independently of where they are located and has universal implications for both rural and urban peoples.

The various institutions of both are not isolated from one another. Instead they influence each other in many significant ways. Recessions and prosperity are aspects of the economic institutions which influence marriage rates, divorce rates, and birth rates of both rural and urban areas. In almost innumerable other ways a reciprocal influence can be shown.

Through the influence of reference groups there exists a symbiotic interdependence and a common value orientation. The human being becomes habituated both to the symbiotic aspect and to the value aspect in the course of his socialization.

Few, if any, cultural areas are completely isolated from all others. Frequent contacts are to be expected when any two cultural areas are in close proximity through mass communication. Once two cultures are brought together, through reference groups of little disparity, their differences become less.

If the increasing impersonality and complexity of modern society, both rural and urban, is considered, it seems reasonable to assume that reference groups serve to interpret the significance of events in the larger social

world and relate them to the individual.

CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Although attitude surveys are filled with limitations, they provide one of the foundations upon which sociology is built. The findings of patterns and the discovering of regularities are the very beginning of any discipline. It is the purpose of this section of the thesis to identify the measurement techniques employed in the investigation of attitudes. Specific attention will be given: to the operationalization of relevant concepts and identification of the independent and dependent variables, the delineation of the sample, an indication of the criteria underlying the implementation and formulation of the instrument used to measure attitudes and to state the hypothesis.

Rural

The greater the number of conditions established in an attempt to circumscribe any variable, the more restrictive it becomes. With relatively few limitations there are a large number of potential variations within the definition. For this reason, the census definition of "rural" and "urban" seems less likely to be misunderstood. If rural and urban attitudes relative to progress are to be

compared, the concepts must be operationalized. The U.S. Census Bureau divides the American population into rural and urban solely on the basis of where they reside rather than on the basis of their occupation, personal values, or other socio-cultural characteristics. Persons who live in the country or in towns of less than 2,500 population are said to be rural. All others are urban. In 1950 urban areas were extended to include the densely settled fringe adjacent to large cities as well as the places of over 2,500 population.¹

The rural population consists of (1) rural farm, and (2) rural-nonfarm people. Rural farm persons live in the open country on farms while persons living in villages of less than 2,500 or in the open country but not on farms are considered rural-nonfarm.²

Progress

The term progress admittedly means different things in different contexts. One could attempt to establish a highly theoretical definition of progress by a semantic approach or an ideal sociological approach but an operational approach is more practical for the purpose of this

¹U.S., Bureau of the Census, 1950 United States Census of Population P-B(41), 1950, pp. IV-VII.

²Ibid.

study.

Since this study utilizes an instrument designed to discriminate between progressive and unprogressive attitudes, the concept of progress is inherent in this instrument.

Progress is, therefore, movement toward a goal which indicates advancement as measured by the instrument.

Interview and Sampling Procedures

The interviewing for this study was conducted in two stages, the first of which occurred in the Groton, South Dakota, area in July of 1967. At this time sixty-nine personal interview questionnaires were completed.

The remaining 187 questionnaires were administered during August of 1967. A team of seven students from the South Dakota State University conducted the interviews. All seven were familiarized with the instrument and were trained in its administration. As a precautionary measure, to minimize the possibility of interviewer bias, all of the interviewers worked in both rural and urban areas. It was felt this procedure would tend to distribute any systematic differences over both areas.

The focus of analysis was Brown County, South Dakota. Its population as far as rural-urban residence is concerned, is comparable proportionately to the state as a whole. While 38.3 percent of the respondents resided in

Aberdeen, South Dakota, which had a population of 23,073, 61.7 percent were from towns with a population of less than 2,500 or open country. The population of South Dakota was 39.3 percent urban and 60.7 percent rural. Aberdeen, South Dakota, is the center for the Aberdeen Area Ministry whose program serves congregations in a seven county area including all of McPherson, Edmunds, and Brown County with parts of Marshall, Day, Spink, and Faulk County.

The total of two hundred and fifty-six respondents were drawn from a stratified sample of church members by utilization of a random numbers table. Respondents were drawn randomly from a list of Protestant church members.

In a stratified sample all individuals are divided into groups and then independent selections are made within each stratum. It is very important that the strata are defined in such a way that each selection appears in only one stratum.³ This principle was adhered to, as sampling lists contained no individuals who belonged to more than one of the churches. In addition to being stratified and random, the sample was proportional in that 2.5 percent of each denomination was selected for interview with the exception of the pre-test area wherein 5 percent were chosen.

³Hubert M. Blalock, Social Statistics (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1960), pp. 392-411.

The Interview Schedule

The instruments used for assessing community variables are scarce.⁴ Claude A. Bosworth developed a community attitude scale designed to assess the degree of progressive attitude manifested by members of a community. The variables measured were the degree of progressive attitudes evidenced in such areas of community life as (1) general community improvement; (2) living conditions; (3) business and industry; (4) health and recreation; (5) education; (6) religion; (7) youth programs; (8) utilities and (9) communications.⁵ Because various tests showed that 60 items were most discriminating, these 60 items were compiled into three subscales with 20 items each. The subscales represent clusters of statements designed to measure the nine variables in terms of a progressive or unprogressive response to attitudes toward community services, community integration, and civic responsibility.⁶

⁴Delbert C. Miller, Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement (New York: David McKay Co., 1964), pp. 192-207.

⁵Claude A. Bosworth, "A Study of the Development and the Validation of a Measure of Citizens' Attitude Toward Progress and Some Variables Related Thereto" (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1954).

⁶See Interview Schedule in the Appendix.

Analysis Procedure

The questionnaire was scored on the basis of a three point scale and each question was scored individually. A progressive response was weighted one (+1), an unprogressive response, minus one (-1), and a neutral response, zero (0). Although the original instrument used the Likert-type five-response scale, there is some evidence that a three-response analysis is as reliable as the five-response scale. A recent study has presented evidence that reliability of rating scales is independent of the number of categories on the scale. Bendig⁷ contends that test reliability is completely independent of the number of scale categories. Inasmuch as the reliability and discrimination of the instrument would not be reduced on the scale, the scoring of the instrument was simplified by using a three-point scoring system even though the schedule as administered had five. The original five were: strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, and strongly disagree; in that order.

Data from the 256 schedules were coded for IBM processing. Tests of significance were conducted using the chi-square statistical technique.

⁷A. W. Bendig, "Reliability and the Number of Rating Scales Categories," Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 38, No. 1 (February, 1954), pp. 38-40.

This research is only attentive to whether a difference exists between rural and urban residents in the progressiveness of attitudes toward their communities. The nature of the data indicates the use of a nonparametric statistical measure. Chi-square analysis provides an appropriate technique for this purpose.

The .05 level of significance was utilized in this study. This places the confidence level at 95 percent so that hypotheses can be rejected with relative certainty.

Research Hypotheses

The following null hypothesis and subhypotheses were formulated as a result of the review of literature and served as the theoretical framework to act as a guide in the research:

1. There is no difference between rural and urban residents' attitudes toward community progress.
 - a. There is no difference between rural and urban residents in their attitudes toward community improvement.
 - b. There is no difference between rural and urban residents in their attitudes toward community integration.
 - c. There is no difference between rural and urban residents in their attitudes toward civic responsibility.

CHAPTER V

THE FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present the findings of the present investigation in terms of the review of literature and the theoretical framework. Thus, the difference between attitudes toward community services, community integration and civic responsibility held by rural and urban residents will be explored through the orientation supplied by both the review of literature and the theoretical framework. The procedure for presenting the findings will be as follows:

1. A statement of the hypothesis concerning its conception and its relation to the theoretical framework will be presented.
2. The hypothesis, stated in its null form for testing, will be presented.
3. The results will be presented and discussed.

Community Services

1. Origin of the Hypothesis. There have been few previous investigations which compare rural and urban differences in attitudes toward community services. However, there is a plethora of literature which deals with rural-urban attitudinal differences.

Larson and Rogers, it will be recalled,¹ indicated the modern American rural population resembles the urban population more than it does the farm population of 1900. More specifically, Lowry Nelson² contends that in general the people of rural America show considerable devotion to the education of their children but are opposed to compulsory school attendance laws, an opposition based on the fear that the farmer would be deprived of the labor of his children. Moreover, according to Nelson, there have been misgivings on the part of rural people that education will teach children to dislike manual labor.

2. Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference between rural and urban residents with regard to attitudes toward community services.

3. The Findings. To test the hypothesis, the first twenty statements from the interview schedule administered to rural people were compared individually with the same statements given to urban respondents. A chi-square analysis for significance was undertaken for each individual statement to determine if there was a

¹Olaf Larson and Everett Rogers, "Rural Society in Transition: The American Setting," Our Changing Rural Society: Perspectives and Trends, ed. James H. Copp (Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press, 1964), p. 54.

²Lowry Nelson, Rural Sociology (New York: American Book Co., 1952), pp. 370-415.

significant difference in progressive attitudes. In only one of the twenty statements did a significant difference occur. The results are indicated in Table I.³

TABLE I.--Adult Education Should be an Essential Part of the Local School Program

Place of Residence	(Progress.) Agree		(Neutral) Undecided		(Unprogress.) Disagree		Total	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Rural	100	64.94	20	12.99	34	22.07	154	100.00
Urban	88	88.89	6	6.06	5	5.05	99	100.00
Total	188	74.31	26	10.28	39	15.41	253	100.00

$$x^2=18.903 \quad P < .001 \quad d.f.=2$$

A disproportionately large share of all respondents agreed with the statement. That is, they agreed that adult education should be an essential part of the local school program. While 74.31 percent of the respondents agreed only 15.41 percent disagreed. Furthermore, urban residents had attitudes more favorable toward adult education than did rural residents. The difference in response would yield the conclusion that on the subject of adult education there are differences not attributable to chance between rural

³The actual chi-square analysis for each statement is included in Appendix B.

and urban respondents.

Responses to the other nineteen statements related to community services yielded no significant attitudinal differences. The absence of difference in 19 out of 20 statements is far more important in the acceptance or rejection of the research hypothesis than is the fact that one had a chi-square value significant at the .01 level. This indicates, that in fact, place of residence is not related to attitudes toward community services.

Empirical evidence does not support Larson and Rogers' contention that rural people are more cosmopolitan in their social relationships because of mass communication, rapid transportation, and the realignment of locality groups. A factor which may influence attitudes in the area of community services is that the establishment of educational standards is increasingly a cooperative responsibility, being shared by local communities as well as state and federal government. Continued progress is being made in legislation regarding education. Many states have laws that require equalization of school tax funds, and thereby alleviate the tax burden for the more thinly populated rural areas. With the narrowing of the gap in educational facilities, rural-urban attitudes toward education would likely be more similar because their respective reference groups become less divergent. Thus, the direction of a

person's attitudes changes over a period of time in line with changes in the attitude norms of his reference groups.

Community Integration

1. Origin of the Hypothesis. In the Review of Literature Nelson showed that since the relations of the rural family with its neighbors is of paramount importance, there would be a high degree of homogeneity of interests, a minimum of stratification, and a maximum of democratic attitudes. If Nelson's contention is tenable, questions 21 through 40 should lend support to his theory. They were designed to measure the respondents' attitudes toward community integration.

2. Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference between rural and urban residents with regard to attitudes toward community integration.

3. The Findings. The findings on the relationship between the dependent variables (attitudes) and the independent variables (place of residence) are presented in the following seven tables. Only those statements wherein a significant difference was found are included.

It can be seen from Table II that rural people are less progressive in their attitudes toward community improvement than are their city cousins. While 51.61 per cent of the former elicited attitudes unfavorable toward

community improvement, only 36.36 percent of the latter did the same. The total agreement was 45.67 percent of the sample which constitutes 116 respondents. The probability of this attitudinal set occurring by chance is less than 2 percent.

TABLE II.--No Community Improvement Program Should be Carried on That is Injurious to Business

Place of Residence	(Unprogress.) Agree		(Neutral) Undecided		(Progress.) Disagree		Total	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Rural	80	51.61	35	22.58	40	25.81	155	100.00
Urban	36	36.36	21	21.21	42	42.43	99	100.00
Total	116	45.67	56	22.05	82	32.28	254	100.00

$$\chi^2 = 8.29519 \quad P < .02 \quad d.f. = 2$$

Table III illustrates the proportionate number of urban respondents who believed everybody should handle his own business and hold a laissez-faire attitude toward businessmen was in excess of those who did not.

The high chi-square value of Table III is not indicative of a favorable attitude toward community integration, in terms of rural residence, because fewer rural residents opposed involvement in community affairs than advocated it. The urban respondents, meanwhile, showed a 42.43 percent disparity between those who agreed and those

who disagreed. This indicates that the urban dweller is far more progressive in his attitude toward community integration than is the rural dweller.

TABLE III.--Each One Should Handle His Own Business as He Pleases and Let the Other Businessmen Handle Theirs as They Please

Place of Residence	(Unprogress.) Agree		(Neutral) Undecided		(Progress.) Disagree		Total	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Rural	74	47.74	13	8.39	68	43.87	155	100.00
Urban	24	24.24	9	9.09	66	66.67	99	100.00
Total	98	38.58	22	8.66	134	52.76	254	100.00

$$\chi^2 = 14.63211$$

$$P < .001$$

$$d.f. = 2$$

The next statement on the questionnaire gave disparate results when it was analyzed as indicated by the following table (Table IV).

The evidence presented on the difference between place of residence and unprogressive or progressive attitudes toward community integration indicates the urban respondent as being slightly more progressive than the rural respondents. Interestingly enough, the urban response is only 1.93 percent higher than the rural. The difference is more significant when the frequency of responses is compared in the agree column wherein there is a rural-urban

discrepancy of 10.17 percent. Rather than drawing a definitive conclusion, however, it should be remembered that the rural respondent comes into contact less with the Chamber of Commerce than does his urban counterpart. Another factor which should be considered is that many of the rural people had only a slight concept of what constituted a Chamber of Commerce.

TABLE IV.--A Strong Chamber of Commerce is Beneficial to Any Community

Place of Residence	(Progress.) Agree		(Neutral) Undecided		(Unprogress.) Disagree		Total	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Rural	116	74.84	33	21.29	6	3.87	155	100.00
Urban	76	76.77	9	9.09	14	14.14	99	100.00
Total	192	75.60	42	16.53	20	7.87	254	100.00

$$X^2=13.560 \quad P < .01 \quad d.f.=2$$

Nelson's judgement that rural residence plays a major role in fostering democratic attitudes would lead one to predict that rural and urban residents would differ in terms of the liberality or conservativeness of their attitudes toward community integration. Table V does not support this contention.

Both urban and rural residents indicate a markedly progressive attitude toward community integration, the

observed frequency in the disagree column is more than 10 times larger than in the agree column. By denying that the Chamber of Commerce is in opposition to the welfare of the majority of the citizens, both categories of respondents manifested liberal attitudes toward community progress.

TABLE V.--Leaders of the Chamber of Commerce Are Against the Welfare of the Majority of the Citizens of the Community

Place of Residence	(Unprogress.) Agree		(Neutral) Undecided		(Progress.) Disagree		Total	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Rural	4	2.60	31	20.13	119	77.27	154	100.00
Urban	13	13.13	7	7.07	79	79.80	99	100.00
Total	17	6.72	38	15.02	198	78.26	254	100.00

$$\chi^2 = 16.84285 \quad P < .001 \quad d.f. = 2$$

The result of the attitudes depicted by Table VI coincide with those which immediately preceded them.

From the percentages computed in Table VI it can be seen that a smaller proportion of the rural respondents manifested more progressive attitudes toward community integration. They favored a more individualistic approach which does not indicate an interrelationship of roles. This was expected from the review of earlier rural-urban theories which asserted rural people were highly

individualistic by virtue of the isolation of their primary occupation. Thus, empirical data from this study seems to support the theory of rural attitudes toward individualism.

TABLE VI.--A Community Would Get Along Better if Each One Would Mind His Own Business and Others Take Care of Theirs

Place of Residence	(Unprogress.) Agree		(Neutral) Undecided		(Progress.) Disagree		Total	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Rural	61	38.85	14	8.92	82	52.23	157	100.00
Urban	19	19.19	6	6.06	74	74.75	99	100.00
Total	80	31.25	20	7.81	156	60.94	256	100.00

$$X^2=13.19704 \quad P < .01 \quad d.f.=2$$

The next statement which was found to exhibit rural-urban attitudinal differences was highly value laden but portrays an interesting bifurcation. The statement was: "All unions are full of Communists." Table VII indicates a significant difference in the responses of urban and rural residents.

While nearly 79 percent of all respondents disagreed with this statement, the proportion of rural respondents disagreeing was lower than that for the urban respondents (75.97 percent and 82.84 percent respectively). The rural respondents also had a larger percentage of "undecided" responses. The urban respondents manifested a more

progressive attitude toward unions than did the rural respondents.

TABLE VII.--All Unions Are Full of Communists

Place of Residence	(Unprogress.) Agree		(Neutral) Undecided		(Progress.) Disagree		Total	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Rural	6	3.90	31	20.13	117	75.97	154	100.00
Urban	7	7.07	9	9.09	82	82.84	98	100.00
Total	13	5.16	40	15.87	199	78.97	252	100.00

$$\chi^2 = 6.19414 \quad P < .05 \quad d.f. = 2$$

The last statement found to be significant in the cluster designed to measure progressive or unprogressive attitudes toward community integration was found to be highly significant.

Table VIII indicates that rural respondents were more willing than the urban to circulate news unfavorable to their reference groups. This would not support the idea that rural groups tend to be more cohesive than urban groups. However, this result also indicates a more progressive attitude on the part of the rural respondents.

The results from the analysis of this section on attitudes toward community integration indicate that for eight of the twenty statements a significant difference

existed between rural and urban respondents.

TABLE VIII.--The Good Citizen Encourages the Widespread Circulation of All News Including That Which May be Unfavorable to Them and Their Organization

Place of Residence	(Progress.) Agree		(Neutral) Undecided		(Unprogress.) Disagree		Total	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Rural	87	56.13	23	14.84	45	29.03	155	100.00
Urban	77	78.57	6	6.12	15	15.21	98	100.00
Total	164	64.82	29	11.46	60	23.72	253	100.00

$$\chi^2 = 13.41428 \quad P < .01 \quad d.f. = 2$$

The following generalizations may be drawn from this analysis.

1. Attitudinal differences between rural and urban residents are not general but are manifested only in specific areas.
2. In all cases where a significant difference was found, urban residents were more progressive in their attitudes toward community integration than were the rural residents.
3. On the basis of this analysis the hypothesis of no difference between rural and urban residents in their attitudes toward community integration cannot be rejected.

Civic Responsibility

1. Origin of the Hypothesis. In the discussion of reference group theory it was noted that a group could be

analyzed in terms of three criteria: (1) a group comprises a number of individuals who interact with one another on the basis of an established pattern; (2) these persons who interact must define themselves as constituting a group; (3) these persons must be defined by others as constituting members of the group.

Upon this description of a group, as it relates to rural or urban groups, the third and final hypothesis was founded. Through the hypothesis an attempt was made to test reference group theory and identify the similarities and disparities of actual reference groups. Since attitudes are formed by a reference group, if there exists no difference in attitudes, the rural and urban reference groups must be similar.

2. Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference between rural and urban residents with regard to attitudes toward civic responsibility.

3. The Findings. The procedure followed to determine if there was any significant difference between rural-urban residence and attitude toward civic responsibility was similar to the methodological approach utilized in analysis of the first hypothesis. To test the hypothesis the last twenty statements from the interview schedule administered to rural people were compared with the same statements given to urban people. Each individual

statement was analyzed to determine if there was a significant difference in progressive or unprogressive attitudes toward civic responsibility. A significant difference was found between rural and urban attitudes in two of the twenty statements. The first of these is presented in Table IX.

TABLE IX.--Government Officials Should Get Public Sentiment Before Acting on Major Municipal Projects

Place of Residence	(Progress.) Agree		(Neutral) Undecided		(Unprogress.) Disagree		Total	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Rural	122	78.71	24	15.48	9	5.81	155	100.00
Urban	86	87.76	5	5.10	7	7.14	98	100.00
Total	208	82.21	29	11.47	16	6.32	253	100.00

$$\chi^2 = 6.41265 \quad P < .05 \quad d.f. = 2$$

Table IX shows an overwhelming majority of respondents indicated agreement with the statement: "Government officials should get public sentiment before acting on major municipal projects." A total of 82.21 percent agreed while only 6.32 percent disagreed. Rural respondents were less favorably disposed to government officials gauging public sentiment than were urban respondents. The responses of rural residents in agreement were 78.71 percent while urban agreement was 87.76 percent.

The unprogressive cells indicate a similar attitudinal set. The difference in percent between rural and urban responses in the disagree column was 1.33 percent but in the agree column it was 8.05. Thus, in attitudes toward civic responsibility rural people were found to be less progressively inclined than urban people.

The last statement designed to measure attitudes toward civic responsibility was: "Modern methods and equipment should be provided for all phases of city government." It was found to be significant at the .02 level which indicates the progressive nature of the response was not a chance phenomenon. Table X illustrates the point.

TABLE X.--Modern Methods and Equipment Should be Provided For All Phases of City Government

Place of Residence	(Progress.) Agree		(Neutral) Undecided		(Unprogress.) Disagree		Total	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Rural	117	75.00	33	21.15	6	3.85	156	100.00
Urban	87	87.58	7	7.07	5	5.05	99	100.00
Total	204	80.00	40	15.69	11	4.31	255	100.00

$$x^2=9.11703 \quad P < .02 \quad d.f.=2$$

The above table shows 80 percent of all the respondents held a progressive attitude toward civic responsibility. Only 4.31 percent indicated an unprogressive reply.

The total number of respondents who showed agreement with this statement was 204 as opposed to 11 who manifested disagreement.

As a result of the analysis of attitudes in this section, the rural resident was not found to manifest conservative attitudes toward civic responsibility. A significant difference between rural and urban respondents' attitudes toward civic responsibility could only be ascertained in two of the 20 statements.

As a result of the analysis of rural and urban attitudes toward civic responsibility, the following propositions may be stated:

1. Any generalization relative to rural or urban attitudes must be couched in terms of a specific statement. Hypotheses about rural and urban attitudes in general are not tenable.
2. In terms of general attitudes toward civic responsibility there is no significant difference between rural residents and urban residents.
3. On the basis of this analysis the hypothesis of no difference between rural and urban residents in their attitudes toward civic responsibility cannot be rejected.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

This study was originated by the Aberdeen Area Ministry in cooperation with the Rural Sociology Department at South Dakota State University, Brookings, South Dakota. Its purpose was to assess the attitudes of rural and urban Protestant church members toward selected aspects of community life. It is part of a larger study which was conducted in order to evaluate peoples' attitudes toward their churches.

Upon reviewing the literature germane to attitudes in general and more specifically toward rural and urban attitudes, it was evident that gross generalizations were expounded which characterized differences between rural and urban residents. This gave rise to the general hypothesis which guided the study, i.e., there is no significant difference between rural and urban residents in their attitudes toward community progress.

The basic premises of reference group theory were enunciated to serve as the conceptual framework for the study. Reference group theory is especially applicable to the study of rural and urban attitudinal structures since an individual's attitudes are strongly influenced by his

reference groups. With the advent of rapid transportation and the expansion of communication through mass media, rural and urban people could reasonably be expected to have similar reference groups. This situation would tend to minimize attitudinal differences between the rural and urban residents.

The census definition of "rural" was used in order to avoid the problems involved in definitions which combine social and cultural characteristics. "Progress" was also defined in operational terms. Thus, rural and progress were operationalized to permit their quantification.

Data for the study were secured by administration of a community attitude scale to 256 respondents selected at random from lists of Protestant church members. The Aberdeen, South Dakota, area was the locus of the study.

The data were analyzed by the use of chi-square analysis. Each individual statement from the questionnaire was subjected to analysis in order to determine if there were any statistically significant differences between respondents who lived in rural areas and those who lived in urban areas in terms of their attitudes toward community progress. For the purpose of a more intensive analysis, community progress was divided into three subcategories. These three subcategories were: community services, community integration, and civic responsibility.

Structural variables such as education, age, and economic class differentials, were not included in the analysis because they tend to exist independently of place of residence.

Conclusions

An analysis of the basic hypotheses of this study yielded the following conclusions:

1. There is no difference between rural and urban residents in their attitudes toward community progress.¹
2. There is no difference between rural and urban residents in their attitudes toward community services.
3. There is no difference between rural and urban residents in their attitudes toward community integration.
4. There is no difference between rural and urban residents in their attitudes toward civic responsibilities.
5. Attitudinal differences between rural and urban residents are not general but are manifested only in specific areas.
6. In all cases where a significant difference was found, urban residents were more progressive in their attitudes toward selected aspects of their community than were rural residents.

On the basis of the analysis of data in this study the hypothesis of no difference between rural and urban

¹In these conclusions the terms "difference" and "significant difference" refer to statistically significant differences.

respondents in their attitudes toward their community cannot be rejected.

LITERATURE CITED

Books

- Bierstedt, Robert. The Social Order: An Introduction to Sociology. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1963.
- Blalock, Hubert M. Social Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1960.
- Bonner, Hubert. Social Psychology. New York: American Book Co., 1953.
- Broom, Leonard, and Selznick, Philip. Sociology: A Text With Adapted Readings. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.
- Copp, James, et al. Our Changing Rural Society. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press, 1964.
- Giddings, Franklin Henry. The Principles of Sociology. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1923.
- Kolb, J. H., and Brunner, Edmund S. A Study of Rural Society: Its Organization and Changes. New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1935.
- Landis, Paul. Rural Life in Process. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1948.
- Larson, Olaf, and Rogers, Everett. "Rural Society in Transition," Our Changing Rural Society: Perspectives and Trends. Edited by James H. Copp. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press, 1964.
- Lundberg, G. A. Social Research. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1946.
- McDavid, John W., and Harari, Herbert. Social Psychology: Individuals, Groups, Societies. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.
- Mead, George H. Mind, Self, and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934.
- Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1957.

- Miller, Delbert C. Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement. New York: David McKay Co., Inc., 1964.
- Nelson, Lowry. Rural Sociology. New York: American Book Co., 1955.
- Newcomb, Theodore, Swanson, Guy E., and Hartley, Eugene L. Readings in Social Psychology. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1952.
- Selltiz, Claire, et al. Research Methods in Social Relations. New York: Holt, Rhinehart and Winston, 1951.
- Sherif, Muzafer, and Sherif, Carolyn. An Outline of Social Psychology. New York: Harper and Row, 1956.
- Sorokin, Pitirim A., and Zimmerman, Carle C. Principles of Rural-Urban Sociology. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1929.
- Stouffer, S. A., et al. The American Soldier. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1949.
- Thomas, William I., and Znaniecki, Florian. The Polish Peasant in America. New York: Dover Press, 1958.
- Warner, W. L., and Lunt, D. S. The Social Life of a Community. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1941.
- Williams, Robin M., Jr. American Society: A Sociological Interpretation. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1960.
- Wirth, Louis. On Cities and Social Life. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Unpublished Material

- Bosworth, Claude A. "A Study of the Development and the Validation of a Measure of Citizens' Attitudes Toward Progress and Some Variables Related Thereto." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1954.

Klug, Hadley. "A Study of Selected Factors Associated With Members Attitudes Toward Their Churches in the Aberdeen Area of South Dakota." Unpublished Master's thesis, Dept. of Rural Sociology, South Dakota State University, 1968.

Articles

Bendig, A. W. "Reliability and the Number of Rating Scales Categories," Journal of Applied Psychology. Vol. 38, No. 1, February, 1954.

Hyman, H. H. "Archives of Psychology," The Psychology of Status. No. 269, 1942.

LaPiere, Richard T. "Attitudes vs. Actions," Social Forces. Vol. 13, 1934.

———. "The Sociological Significance of Measureable Attitudes," American Sociological Review. Vol. 21, 1938.

Yinger, Milton J. "Contraculture and Culture," American Sociological Review. Vol. XXV, October, 1960.

Public Documents

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1950 United States Census of Population P-B(41). 1950.

APPENDIX A

COMMUNITY ATTITUDE SCALE

	St. Agree	Agree	?	Disagree	St. Dis.
1. The school should stick to the 3 R's and forget about most of the other courses being offered today.	—	—	—	—	—
2. Most communities are good enough as they are without starting any new community improvement programs.	—	—	—	—	—
3. Every community should encourage more music and lecture programs.	—	—	—	—	—
4. This used to be a better community to live in.	—	—	—	—	—
5. Long term progress is more important than immediate benefits.	—	—	—	—	—
6. We have too many organizations for doing good in the community.	—	—	—	—	—
7. The home and the church should have all the responsibility for preparing young people for marriage and parenthood.	—	—	—	—	—
8. The responsibility for older people should be confined to themselves and their families instead of the community.	—	—	—	—	—
9. Communities have too many youth programs.	—	—	—	—	—
10. Schools are good enough as they are in most communities.	—	—	—	—	—
11. Too much time is usually spent on the planning phases of community projects.	—	—	—	—	—
12. Adult education should be an essential part of the local school program.	—	—	—	—	—

	St. Agree	Agree	?	Disagree	St. Dis.
13. Only the doctors should have the responsibility for the health program in the community.	—	—	—	—	—
14. Mental illness is not a responsibility of the whole community.	—	—	—	—	—
15. A modern community should have the services of social agencies.	—	—	—	—	—
16. The spiritual needs of the citizens are adequately met by the churches.	—	—	—	—	—
17. In order to grow, a community must provide additional recreation facilities.	—	—	—	—	—
18. In general, church members are better citizens.	—	—	—	—	—
19. The social needs of the citizens are the responsibility of themselves and their families and not of the community.	—	—	—	—	—
20. Churches should be expanded and located in accordance with population growth.	—	—	—	—	—
21. No community improvement program should be carried on that is injurious to a business.	—	—	—	—	—
22. Industrial development should include assistance to existing local industry, as well as bringing in new industries.	—	—	—	—	—
23. The first and major responsibility of each citizen should be to earn dollars for his own pocket.	—	—	—	—	—
24. More industry in town lowers the living standards.	—	—	—	—	—

	St. Agree	Agree	?	Disagree	St. Dis.
25. The responsibility of citizens who are not actively participating in a community improvement program is to criticize those who are active.	—	—	—	—	—
26. What is good for the community is good for me.	—	—	—	—	—
27. Each one should handle his own business as he pleases and let the other businessmen handle theirs as they please.	—	—	—	—	—
28. A strong Chamber of Commerce is beneficial to any community.	—	—	—	—	—
29. Leaders of the Chamber of Commerce are against the welfare of the majority of the citizens in the community.	—	—	—	—	—
30. A community would get along better if each one would mind his own business and others take care of theirs.	—	—	—	—	—
31. Members of any community organization should be expected to attend only those meetings that affect him personally.	—	—	—	—	—
32. Each of us can make real progress only when the group as a whole makes progress.	—	—	—	—	—
33. The person who pays no attention to the complaints of the persons working for him is a poor citizen.	—	—	—	—	—
34. It would be better if we would have the farmer look after his own business and we look after ours.	—	—	—	—	—
35. All unions are full of Communists.	—	—	—	—	—

	St. Agree	Agree	?	Disagree	St. Dis.
36. The good citizens encourage the wide-spread circulation of all news including that which may be unfavorable to them and their organizations.	—	—	—	—	—
37. The good citizen should help minority groups with their problems.	—	—	—	—	—
38. The farmer has too prominent a place in our society.	—	—	—	—	—
39. A citizen should join only those organizations that will promote his own interests.	—	—	—	—	—
40. Everyone is out for himself at the expense of everyone else.	—	—	—	—	—
41. Busy people should not have the responsibility for civic programs.	—	—	—	—	—
42. The main responsibility for keeping the community clean is up to the city officials.	—	—	—	—	—
43. Community improvements are fine if they don't increase taxes.	—	—	—	—	—
44. The younger element have too much to say about our community affairs.	—	—	—	—	—
45. A progressive community must provide adequate parking facilities.	—	—	—	—	—
46. Government officials should get public sentiment before acting on major municipal projects.	—	—	—	—	—
47. A good citizen should be willing to assume leadership in a civic improvement organization.	—	—	—	—	—

	St. Agree	Agree	?	Disagree	St. Dis.
48. Progress can best be accomplished by having only a few people involved.	—	—	—	—	—
49. Community improvement should be the concern of only a few leaders in the community.	—	—	—	—	—
50. A community would be better if less people would spend time on community improvement projects.	—	—	—	—	—
51. Only those who have the most time should assume the responsibility for civic programs.	—	—	—	—	—
52. Living conditions in a community should be improved.	—	—	—	—	—
53. A good citizen should sign petitions for community improvement.	—	—	—	—	—
54. Improving slum areas is a waste of money.	—	—	—	—	—
55. The police force should be especially strict with outsiders.	—	—	—	—	—
56. The paved streets and roads in most communities are good enough.	—	—	—	—	—
57. The sewage system of a community must be expanded as it grows even though it is necessary to increase taxes.	—	—	—	—	—
58. Some people just want to live in slum areas.	—	—	—	—	—
59. The main problem we face is high taxes.	—	—	—	—	—
60. Modern methods and equipment should be provided for all phases of city government.	—	—	—	—	—

APPENDIX B

TABLE I.--The School Should Stick To the 3 R's And Forget
About Most of the Other Courses Being Offered
Today

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	27 (32.34)*	9 (6.71)	119 (115.94)	155 (155)
Urban	26 (20.66)	2 (4.29)	71 (74.06)	99 (99)
Total	53 (53)	11 (11)	190 (190)	254 (254)**

$$\chi^2 = 4.47058 \quad 2 \text{ d.f.***}$$

TABLE II.--Most Communities Are Good Enough As They Are
Without Starting Any New Community Improve-
ment Programs

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	27 (20.80)	2 (1.84)	127 (133.36)	156 (156)
Urban	7 (13.20)	1 (1.16)	91 (84.64)	99 (99)
Total	34 (34)	3 (3)	218 (218)	255 (255)

$$\chi^2 = 5.58066$$

*Numbers in parenthesis represent expected frequencies.

**These totals will vary because of "no response."

***All of the tables in this Appendix have 2 degrees of freedom.

TABLE III.--Every Community Should Encourage More Music and Lecture Programs

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	111 (113.83)	23 (20.70)	20 (19.48)	154 (154)
Urban	76 (73.17)	11 (13.30)	12 (12.52)	99 (99)
Total	187 (187)	34 (34)	32 (32)	253 (253)

$$x^2=0.87073$$

TABLE IV.--This Used to be a Better Community to Live in.

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	35 (28.61)	21 (21.91)	98 (103.48)	154 (154)
Urban	12 (18.39)	15 (14.09)	72 (66.52)	99 (99)
Total	47 (47)	36 (36)	170 (170)	253 (253)

$$x^2=4.48733$$

TABLE V.--Long Term Progress is More Important Than
Immediate Benefits

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	104 (103.13)	28 (25.63)	23 (26.24)	155 (155)
Urban	65 (65.87)	14 (16.37)	20 (16.76)	99 (99)
Total	169 (169)	42 (42)	43 (43)	254 (254)

$$\chi^2=1.60765$$

TABLE VI.--We Have Too Many Organizations For Doing Good
In The Community

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	22 (25.08)	12 (10.40)	122 (120.52)	156 (156)
Urban	19 (15.92)	5 (6.60)	75 (76.48)	99 (99)
Total	41 (41)	17 (17)	197 (197)	255 (255)

$$\chi^2=1.65666$$

TABLE VII.--The Home and the Church Should Have All the
Responsibility For Preparing Young People
For Marriage and Parenthood

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	71 (69.30)	15 (12.27)	71 (75.43)	157 (157)
Urban	42 (43.70)	5 (7.73)	52 (47.57)	99 (99)
Total	113 (113)	20 (20)	123 (123)	256 (256)

$$\chi^2 = 2.35784$$

TABLE VIII.--The Responsibility For Older People Should be
Confined to Themselves and Their Families
Instead of the Community

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	36 (34.34)	9 (6.75)	112 (115.91)	157 (157)
Urban	20 (21.66)	2 (4.25)	77 (73.09)	99 (99)
Total	56 (56)	11 (11)	189 (189)	256 (256)

$$\chi^2 = 2.49489$$

TABLE IX.--Communities Have Too Many Youth Programs

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	13 (13.49)	4 (6.13)	140 (137.38)	157 (157)
Urban	9 (8.51)	6 (3.87)	84 (86.63)	99 (99)
Total	22 (22)	10 (10)	224 (224)	256 (256)

$$\chi^2 = 2.09414$$

TABLE X.--Schools Are Good Enough As They Are in Most Communities

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	33 (31.28)	17 (15.95)	107 (109.78)	157 (157)
Urban	18 (19.72)	9 (10.05)	72 (69.22)	99 (99)
Total	51 (51)	26 (26)	179 (179)	256 (256)

$$\chi^2 = 0.60743$$

TABLE XI.--Too Much Time is Usually Spent on the Planning Phases of Community Projects

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	37 (44.43)	25 (20.70)	92 (88.87)	154 (154)
Urban	36 (28.57)	9 (13.30)	54 (57.13)	99 (99)
Total	73 (73)	34 (34)	146 (146)	253 (253)

$$\chi^2 = 5.74867$$

TABLE XII.--Adult Education Should be an Essential Part of the Local School Program

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	100 (114.43)	20 (15.83)	34 (23.74)	154 (154)
Urban	88 (73.57)	6 (10.17)	5 (15.26)	99 (99)
Total	188 (188)	26 (26)	39 (39)	253 (253)

$$\chi^2 = 18.903$$

TABLE XIII.--Only the Doctors Should Have the Responsibility For the Health Program in the Community

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	26 (24.57)	14 (10.44)	116 (120.99)	156 (156)
Urban	14 (15.43)	3 (6.56)	81 (76.01)	98 (98)
Total	40 (40)	17 (17)	197 (197)	254 (254)

$$\chi^2 = 3.89491$$

TABLE XIV.--Mental Illness is Not a Responsibility of the Whole Community

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	31 (27.60)	13 (10.43)	113 (118.98)	157 (157)
Urban	14 (17.40)	4 (6.57)	81 (75.02)	99 (99)
Total	45 (45)	17 (17)	194 (194)	256 (256)

$$\chi^2 = 3.50454$$

TABLE XV.--A Modern Community Should Have the Services of Social Agencies

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	127 (131.53)	15 (11.62)	14 (12.85)	156 (156)
Urban	88 (83.47)	4 (7.38)	7 (8.15)	99 (99)
Total	215 (215)	19 (19)	21 (21)	255 (255)

$$\chi^2=3.19461$$

TABLE XVI.--The Spiritual Needs of the Citizens Are Adequately Met By the Churches

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	82 (83.20)	19 (17.74)	55 (55.06)	156 (156)
Urban	54 (52.80)	10 (11.26)	35 (34.94)	99 (99)
Total	136 (136)	29 (29)	90 (90)	255 (255)

$$\chi^2=0.27481$$

TABLE XVII.--In Order to Grow, A Community Must Provide
Additional Recreation Facilities

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	120 (124.80)	14 (9.79)	22 (21.41)	156 (156)
Urban	84 (79.20)	2 (6.21)	13 (13.59)	99 (99)
Total	204 (204)	16 (16)	35 (35)	255 (255)

$$\chi^2=5.18512$$

TABLE XVIII.--In General, Church Members Are Better
Citizens

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	118 (119.59)	12 (13.49)	27 (23.92)	157 (157)
Urban	77 (75.41)	10 (8.51)	12 (15.08)	99 (99)
Total	195 (195)	22 (22)	39 (39)	256 (256)

$$\chi^2=1.50836$$

TABLE XIX.--The Social Needs of the Citizens Are the Responsibility of Themselves and Their Families and Not of the Community

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	43 (39.76)	17 (14.68)	96 (101.55)	156 (156)
Urban	22 (25.24)	7 (9.32)	70 (64.45)	99 (99)
Total	65 (65)	24 (24)	166 (166)	255 (255)

$$\chi^2 = 2.40243$$

TABLE XX.--Churches Should Be Expanded and Located In Accordance With Population Growth

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	117 (122.35)	12 (12.85)	27 (20.80)	156 (156)
Urban	83 (77.65)	9 (8.15)	7 (13.20)	99 (99)
Total	200 (200)	21 (21)	34 (34)	255 (255)

$$\chi^2 = 5.50728$$

TABLE XXI.--No Community Improvement Program Should be
Carried On That is Injurious to a Business

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	80 (70.79)	35 (34.17)	40 (50.04)	155 (155)
Urban	36 (45.21)	21 (21.83)	42 (31.96)	99 (99)
Total	166 (166)	56 (56)	82 (82)	254 (254)

$$\chi^2 = 8.29519$$

TABLE XXII.--Industrial Development Should Include
Assistance to Existing Local Industry,
as Well as Bringing in New Industries

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	124 (135.20)	27 (16.52)	5 (4.28)	156 (156)
Urban	97 (85.80)	0 (10.48)	2 (2.72)	99 (99)
Total	221 (221)	27 (27)	7 (7)	255 (255)

$$\chi^2 = 19.83420$$

TABLE XXIII.--The First and Major Responsibility of Each
Citizen Should Be to Earn Dollars For His
Own Pocket

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	45 (43.54)	11 (11.65)	101 (101.80)	157 (157)
Urban	26 (27.46)	8 (7.35)	65 (64.20)	99 (99)
Total	71 (71)	19 (19)	166 (166)	256 (256)

$$\chi^2=0.23696$$

TABLE XXIV.--More Industry in Town Lowers the Living
Standards

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	11 (11.01)	25 (20.19)	120 (124.80)	156 (156)
Urban	7 (6.99)	8 (12.81)	84 (79.20)	99 (99)
Total	18 (18)	33 (33)	204 (204)	255 (255)

$$\chi^2=3.42959$$

TABLE XXV.--The Responsibility of Citizens Who Are Not
Actively Participating in A Community Im-
provement Program is to Criticize Those
Who Are Active

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	16 (20.19)	5 (6.73)	135 (129.08)	156 (156)
Urban	17 (12.81)	6 (4.27)	76 (81.92)	99 (99)
Total	33 (33)	11 (11)	211 (211)	255 (255)

$$x^2=4.08160$$

TABLE XXVI.--What is Good For the Community is Good For Me

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	117 (118.68)	16 (14.07)	23 (23.25)	156 (156)
Urban	77 (75.32)	7 (8.93)	15 (14.75)	99 (99)
Total	194 (194)	23 (23)	38 (38)	255 (255)

$$x^2=0.74965$$

TABLE XXVII.--Each One Should Handle His Own Business as
He Pleases And Let the Other Businessmen
Handle Theirs as They Please

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	74 (59.80)	13 (13.43)	68 (81.77)	155 (155)
Urban	24 (38.20)	9 (8.57)	66 (52.23)	99 (99)
Total	98 (98)	22 (22)	134 (134)	254 (254)

$$\chi^2 = 14.63211$$

TABLE XXVIII.--A Strong Chamber of Commerce is Beneficial
to Any Community

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	116 (117.17)	33 (25.63)	6 (12.20)	155 (155)
Urban	76 (74.83)	9 (16.37)	14 (7.80)	99 (99)
Total	192 (192)	42 (42)	20 (20)	254 (254)

$$\chi^2 = 13.56030$$

TABLE XXIX.--Leaders of the Chamber of Commerce Are
Against the Welfare of the Majority of
the Citizens in the Community

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	4 (10.35)	31 (23.13)	119 (120.52)	154 (154)
Urban	13 (6.65)	7 (14.87)	79 (77.48)	99 (99)
Total	17 (17)	38 (38)	198 (198)	253 (253)

$$\chi^2=16.84285$$

TABLE XXX.--A Community Would Get Along Better If Each One
Would Mind His Own Business and Others Take
Care of Theirs

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	61 (49.06)	14 (12.27)	82 (95.67)	157 (157)
Urban	19 (30.94)	6 (7.73)	74 (60.33)	99 (99)
Total	80 (80)	20 (20)	156 (156)	256 (256)

$$\chi^2=13.19704$$

TABLE XXXI.--Members of Any Community Organization Should
Be Expected to Attend Only Those Meetings
That Affect Him Personally

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	15 (15.91)	13 (9.79)	128 (130.31)	156 (156)
Urban	11 (10.09)	3 (6.21)	85 (82.69)	99 (99)
Total	26 (26)	16 (16)	213 (213)	255 (255)

$$x^2=2.95248$$

TABLE XXXII.--Each of Us Can Make Real Progress Only When
the Group As A Whole Makes Progress

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	116 (120.83)	14 (9.76)	25 (24.41)	155 (155)
Urban	82 (77.17)	2 (6.24)	15 (15.59)	99 (99)
Total	198 (198)	16 (16)	40 (40)	254 (254)

$$x^2=5.24697$$

TABLE XXXIII.--The Person Who Pays No Attention to the
Complaints of the Persons Working for
Him is a Poor Citizen

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	122 (125.72)	11 (9.20)	24 (22.08)	157 (157)
Urban	83 (79.28)	4 (5.80)	12 (13.92)	99 (99)
Total	205 (205)	15 (15)	36 (36)	256 (256)

$$\chi^2=1.62918$$

TABLE XXXIV.--It Would Be Better If We Would Have the
Farmer Look After His Own Business And
We Look After Ours

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	36 (33.78)	15 (13.51)	105 (108.71)	156 (156)
Urban	19 (21.22)	7 (8.49)	72 (68.29)	98 (98)
Total	55 (55)	22 (22)	177 (177)	254 (254)

$$\chi^2=1.13106$$

TABLE XXXV.--All Unions Are Full of Communists

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	6 (7.94)	31 (24.44)	117 (121.61)	154 (154)
Urban	7 (5.06)	9 (15.56)	82 (77.39)	98 (98)
Total	13 (13)	40 (40)	199 (199)	252 (252)

$$\chi^2 = 6.19414$$

TABLE XXXVI.--The Good Citizens Encourage the Widespread Circulation of All News Including That Which May Be Unfavorable to Them and Their Organization

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	87 (100.47)	23 (17.77)	45 (36.76)	155 (155)
Urban	77 (63.53)	6 (11.23)	15 (23.24)	98 (98)
Total	164 (164)	29 (29)	60 (60)	253 (253)

$$\chi^2 = 13.41428$$

TABLE XXXVII.--The Good Citizen Should Help Minority Groups
With Their Problems

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	146 (147.40)	6 (4.91)	4 (3.69)	156 (156)
Urban	94 (92.60)	2 (3.09)	2 (2.31)	98 (98)
Total	240 (240)	8 (8)	6 (6)	254 (254)

$$\chi^2=0.72715$$

TABLE XXXVIII.--The Farmer Has Too Prominent A Place in Our
Society

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	12 (11.70)	11 (7.39)	134 (137.91)	157 (157)
Urban	7 (7.30)	1 (4.61)	90 (86.09)	99 (99)
Total	19 (19)	12 (12)	224 (224)	255 (255)

$$\chi^2=4.90350$$

TABLE XXXIX.--A Citizen Should Join Only Those Organizations That Will Promote His Own Interests

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	28 (27.30)	6 (5.58)	123 (124.11)	157 (157)
Urban	16 (16.70)	3 (3.42)	77 (75.89)	96 (96)
Total	44 (44)	9 (9)	200 (200)	253 (253)

$$\chi^2=0.15418$$

TABLE XL.--Everyone Is Out For Himself At the Expense of Everyone Else

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	21 (21.58)	12 (11.10)	123 (123.32)	156 (156)
Urban	14 (13.42)	6 (6.90)	77 (76.68)	97 (97)
Total	35 (35)	18 (18)	200 (200)	253 (253)

$$\chi^2=0.23382$$

TABLE XLI.--Busy People Should Not Have the Responsibility
For Civic Programs

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	14 (12.28)	8 (6.14)	134 (137.57)	156 (156)
Urban	6 (7.72)	2 (3.86)	90 (86.43)	98 (98)
Total	20 (20)	10 (10)	224 (224)	254 (254)

$$\chi^2 = 2.31972$$

TABLE XLII.--The Main Responsibility For Keeping the Com-
munity Clean is Up to the City Officials

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	17 (16.62)	2 (1.23)	138 (139.15)	157 (157)
Urban	10 (10.38)	0 (0.77)	88 (86.85)	98 (98)
Total	27 (27)	2 (2)	226 (226)	255 (255)

$$\chi^2 = 1.29511$$

TABLE XLIII.--Community Improvements Are Fine If They
Don't Increase Taxes

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	35 (30.17)	9 (9.85)	113 (116.98)	157 (157)
Urban	14 (18.83)	7 (6.15)	77 (73.02)	98 (98)
Total	49 (49)	16 (16)	190 (190)	255 (255)

$$\chi^2 = 2.55695$$

TABLE XLIV.--The Younger Element Have Too Much to Say
About Our Community Affairs

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	11 (10.44)	12 (11.67)	133 (133.89)	156 (156)
Urban	6 (6.56)	7 (7.33)	85 (84.11)	98 (98)
Total	17 (17)	19 (19)	218 (218)	254 (254)

$$\chi^2 = 0.11720$$

TABLE XLV.--A Progressive Community Must Provide Adequate
Parking Facilities

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	141 (143.45)	11 (8.62)	5 (4.93)	157 (157)
Urban	92 (89.55)	3 (5.38)	3 (3.07)	98 (98)
Total	233 (233)	14 (14)	8 (8)	255 (255)

$$\chi^2 = 1.82275$$

TABLE XLVI.--Government Officials Should Get Public Sentiment
Before Acting on Major Municipal Projects

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	122 (127.43)	24 (17.77)	9 (9.80)	155 (155)
Urban	86 (80.57)	5 (11.23)	7 (6.20)	98 (98)
Total	208 (208)	29 (29)	16 (16)	253 (253)

$$\chi^2 = 6.41265$$

TABLE XLVII.--A Good Citizen Should Be Willing to Assume
Leadership In A Civic Improvement
Organization

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	143 (145.56)	8 (6.76)	5 (3.69)	156 (156)
Urban	94 (91.44)	3 (4.24)	1 (2.31)	98 (98)
Total	237 (237)	11 (11)	6 (6)	254 (254)

$$\chi^2 = 1.92655$$

TABLE XLVIII.--Progress Can Best Be Accomplished By Having
Only A Few People Involved

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	20 (16.65)	9 (6.78)	127 (132.57)	156 (156)
Urban	7 (10.35)	2 (4.22)	88 (82.43)	97 (97)
Total	27 (27)	11 (11)	215 (215)	253 (253)

$$\chi^2 = 4.26106$$

TABLE XLIX.--Community Improvement Should Be the Concern
of Only A Few Leaders in the Community

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	8 (6.16)	4 (2.46)	145 (148.38)	157 (157)
Urban	2 (3.84)	0 (1.54)	96 (92.62)	98 (98)
Total	10 (10)	4 (4)	241 (241)	255 (255)

$$\chi^2 = 4.13575$$

TABLE L.--A Community Would Be Better If Less People Would
Spend Time on Community Improvement Projects

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	15 (11.67)	7 (4.91)	134 (139.42)	156 (156)
Urban	4 (7.33)	1 (3.09)	93 (87.58)	98 (98)
Total	19 (19)	8 (8)	227 (227)	254 (254)

$$\chi^2 = 5.30629$$

TABLE LI.--Only Those Who Have the Most Time Should Assume the Responsibility For Civic Programs

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	20 (15.29)	3 (4.28)	133 (136.42)	156 (156)
Urban	5 (9.71)	4 (21.72)	90 (86.58)	99 (99)
Total	25 (25)	7 (7)	223 (223)	255 (255)

$$\chi^2 = 4.93999$$

TABLE LII.--Living Conditions in a Community Should Be Improved

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	131 (132.75)	16 (16.52)	9 (6.73)	156 (156)
Urban	86 (84.25)	11 (10.48)	2 (4.27)	99 (99)
Total	217 (217)	27 (27)	11 (11)	255 (255)

$$\chi^2 = 2.07476$$

TABLE LIII.--A Good Citizen Should Sign Petitions For
Community Improvement

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	120 (120.38)	26 (25.80)	10 (9.83)	156 (156)
Urban	76 (75.62)	16 (16.20)	6 (6.17)	98 (98)
Total	196 (196)	42 (42)	16 (16)	254 (254)

$$\chi^2 = 0.01520$$

TABLE LIV.--Improving Slum Areas is a Waste of Money

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	6 (7.34)	11 (9.18)	139 (139.58)	156 (156)
Urban	6 (4.66)	4 (5.82)	89 (88.52)	99 (99)
Total	12 (12)	15 (15)	228 (228)	255 (255)

$$\chi^2 = 1.56879$$

TABLE LV.--The Police Force Should Be Especially Strict
With Outsiders

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	22 (18.38)	19 (17.15)	114 (199.47)	155 (155)
Urban	8 (11.62)	9 (10.85)	81 (75.53)	98 (98)
Total	30 (30)	28 (28)	195 (195)	253 (253)

$$\chi^2 = 2.99974$$

TABLE LVI.--The Paved Streets and Roads in Most Communities
Are Good Enough

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	25 (20.19)	14 (16.52)	117 (119.29)	156 (156)
Urban	8 (12.81)	13 (10.48)	78 (75.71)	99 (99)
Total	33 (33)	27 (27)	195 (195)	255 (255)

$$\chi^2 = 4.05610$$

TABLE LVII.--The Sewage System of A Community Must Be
Expanded as It Grows Even Though It is
Necessary To Increase Taxes

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	139 (141.32)	11 (7.95)	6 (6.73)	156 (156)
Urban	92 (89.68)	2 (5.05)	5 (4.27)	99 (99)
Total	231 (231)	13 (13)	11 (11)	255 (255)

$$\chi^2=3.30858$$

TABLE LVIII.--Some People Just Want To Live In Slum Areas

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	35 (38.54)	23 (23.86)	98 (93.60)	156 (156)
Urban	28 (24.46)	16 (15.14)	55 (59.40)	99 (99)
Total	63 (63)	39 (39)	153 (153)	255 (255)

$$\chi^2=1.45045$$

TABLE LIX.--The Main Problem We Face is High Taxes

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	60 (55.67)	14 (15.91)	82 (84.42)	156 (156)
Urban	31 (35.33)	12 (10.09)	56 (53.58)	99 (99)
Total	91 (91)	26 (26)	138 (138)	255 (255)

$$\chi^2 = 1.63465$$

TABLE LX.--Modern Methods And Equipment Should Be Provided For All Phases of City Government

Place of Residence	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Rural	117 (124.80)	33 (24.47)	6 (6.73)	156 (156)
Urban	87 (79.20)	7 (15.53)	5 (4.27)	99 (99)
Total	204 (204)	40 (40)	11 (11)	255 (255)

$$\chi^2 = 9.11703$$

OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORY OF RESPONDENT

Occupation	Urban	Rural	Total
Professional & Technical	22	7	29
Managers, Officials, Proprs.	6	7	13
Housewife	39	91	130
Farmer	0	16	16
Clerical	6	10	16
Service Workers & Operatives	13	12	25
Retired	12	14	26
Unemployed	1	0	1
Total	99	157	256

HARTMAN STATE OF INDEPENDENTS

OWNERSHIP OF HOME OR FARM

Property Ownership	Urban	Rural	Total
Yes	79	133	212
No	20	24	44
Total	99	157	256

MARITAL STATUS OF RESPONDENTS

Marital Status	Urban	Rural	Total
Single	5	5	10
Married	78	131	209
Widowed	14	19	33
Separated	1	0	1
Divorced	1	2	3
Total	99	157	256

EDUCATION OF RESPONDENTS

Education	Urban	Rural	Total
Less than 8 grades	2	7	9
8	10	32	42
9-11	5	18	23
12	29	64	93
13-15	31	27	58
16	13	7	20
17 or more	9	2	11
Total	99	157	256

SEX OF RESPONDENT

Sex of Respondent	Urban	Rural	Total
Male	25	35	60
Female	74	122	196
Total	99	157	255

AGE OF RESPONDENT

Age of Respondent	Urban	Rural	Total
18-19	0	1	1
20-24	5	6	11
25-29	8	9	17
30-34	13	9	22
35-39	15	18	33
40-44	12	20	32
45-49	8	20	28
50-54	13	15	28
55-59	2	12	14
60-64	8	16	24
65-69	7	11	18
70-74	2	8	10
75-79	6	6	12
80 and over	0	6	6
Total	99	157	256

RESPONDENT'S LENGTH OF RESIDENCE
AT PRESENT LOCATION

Length of Residence	Urban	Rural	Total
One year or less	3	4	7
2-5	11	7	18
6-10	23	12	35
11-15	18	21	39
16-20	9	33	42
21-25	7	23	30
26-30	10	16	26
31-35	2	7	9
36-40	5	9	14
41-45	2	5	7
46-50	7	4	11
51 and over	2	16	18
Total	99	157	256

PLACE OF RESIDENCE OF RESPONDENTS

Place of Residence	Total	Total	Total	Sum of Totals
Open Country or Village	0	0	96	96
Town-Population 250-2,499	0	61	0	61
City	99	0	0	99
Total	99	61	96	256

RESPONDENT'S POSITION IN HOUSEHOLD

Respondent's Position in Household	Urban	Rural	Total
Mother/Wife	58	110	168
Father/Husband	23	27	50
Son (over 18)	0	2	2
Daughter (over 18)	0	1	1
Widow	12	10	22
Widower	1	5	6
Bachelor	1	1	2
Unmarried Female	4	1	5
Total	99	157	256

NUMBER OF PEOPLE IN RESPONDENT'S HOUSEHOLD
INCLUDING THE RESPONDENT

Size of Household of Respondent	Urban	Rural	Total
1	13	12	25
2	19	45	64
3-4	33	48	81
5-6	27	44	71
7-8	6	7	13
9-10	1	1	2
11 or more	0	0	0
Total	99	157	256